Objective:

Understand the authorization process and what happens to the Final Feasibility report when it leaves the District!

Washington Level Review Process

Civil Works Orientation Course





STEP 10

Division Engineer's Public Notice

Division Engineer's Public Notice

- **Summarizes the feasibility report recommendation(s)**
- **Request written comments**
- **Describes the remaining processing a[illegible]s in Washin[illegible]**



DE's Notice - EXAMPLE

US Army Corps
of Engineers
South Pacific Division
333 Market Street
Room 923
San Francisco, CA 94105-2195

Public Notice

Feasibility Report
for
Tule River Basin Investigation
California

September 30, 1999

COMPLETION OF STUDIES:

Notice is hereby given that the Sacramento District and South Pacific Division Commanders have completed an interim feasibility study of flood damage reduction and water conservation opportunities associated with the Tule River Basin and Success Dam in the San Joaquin River Basin, California. The report was prepared under the San Joaquin River Basin Investigation as authorized by the resolution adopted May 8, 1964, by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, United States Congress. The feasibility study was conducted as a cost-shared study with the Lower Tule River Irrigation District.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Tule River Basin drains the western slopes of the Sierra Nevada Mountains (See Enclosure 1). The Corps of Engineers constructed success Dam in 1961 to provide flood damage reduction and irrigation water supply and controls approximately 393 square miles of the drainage basin. The dam is a rolled earthfill structure and impounds a reservoir design capacity of 80,000 acre-feet at pool elevation of 652.5 feet. The main dam is 145 feet high and 3,404 feet long and crests at elevation 691.5 feet. Ninety percent of the precipitation in the basin occurs between November and April and is generally snow above elevation 5,000 feet and rain below that elevation. Below the dam, the Tule River flows east and eventually reaches the terminus at the Tulare lakebed. The Tulare lakebed, a highly productive agricultural area covering approximately 250,000 acres is subject to long periods of inundation. The dam provides flood protection and water supply to the Central Valley and is located 6 miles east of the City of Porterville, California and about 75 miles southeast of Fresno, California.

This report presents the results of the feasibility study to alleviate flooding and other water resources problems in the Tule River Basin. The study investigated the feasibility of providing increased flood damage reduction to Porterville and downstream agricultural lands and increased water supply. The measures considered included nonstructural, ground water recharge and spreading, levee and channel construction, additional upstream reservoirs, sediment removal from Lake Success and the enlargement of Lake Success.

The evaluation of the alternative plans included an assessment of contributions to National Economic Development (NED) based on comparison of project monetary costs and benefits. The NED

Tule River and at Success Dam. The recommended plan for raising and lengthening of the spillway was presented at a public workshop on May 13, 1999, at the Porterville Public Library in Porterville, California.

The State of California, Reclamation Board (Tule River Joint Power Authority, as the local project sponsor) is the non-federal sponsor for the design and construction phase of the project, fully supports the NED recommendation and has indicated its intent to provide all non-Federal costs and associated features required by law for this project.

REVIEW PROCESS:

Prior to adoption of the proposed project, the study evaluations and report findings will be reviewed by the Chief of Engineers and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works A coordinated review, including affected state and other Federal agencies, will also be accomplished at that time. The Chief of Engineers will review the report and forward a recommendation to the Secretary of the Army.

If the recommendations of the Chief is significantly different from the recommendation coordinated with State and Federal agencies, interested parties will be afforded an opportunity to comment further prior to submission of the Chief's report to the Secretary.

VIEWS OF INTERESTED PARTIES:

Interested parties may present written views on the report to the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army. Such communications should be mailed to the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Policy Review and Analysis Division, Management and Review Office, 7701 Telegraph Road, Alexandria, VA 22315-3861, within 30 days from the date of this notice. Copies of information received by mail will be regarded as public information unless the correspondent requests otherwise. Such a request will limit the usefulness of the information because of the need for full public disclosure of all factors relevant to the decision.

FINAL ACTION BY THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS:

The Chief of Engineers will not submit a recommendation to the Secretary on the report until after the expiration of this notice or any extension thereof that may be granted, and full consideration of all information submitted in response thereto.

REPORT INFORMATION:

Further information may be obtained from the Sacramento District Commander, U.S. Army Engineer District, 1325 J Street, Sacramento, California 95814-2922. Interested parties may obtain copies of the one-volume feasibility report, including the main report and the EIS/EIR from the District Engineer free of charge as long as copies are available.

Additional copies of the report volumes will also be on file and available for public review at libraries shown on the enclosed list (Enclosure 2). Please pass along a copy of this public notice to anyone who may be interested in the report and who has not received a copy.

Thomas J. Hodgini
Colonel, Corps of Engineer
Acting Commander

Enclosures

Plan, which maximizes the net NED benefits, was determined to consist of raising the existing spillway of Success Dam by 10 feet. The NED plan has an estimated first cost of $20,963,000 with a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.2. Spillway modifications include the placing of an ungated, 10-foot high concrete ogee weir over the entire existing spillway sill and widening the spillway from 200 to 365 feet. Relocations include the raising of utility line towers crossing the project area. The State Highway 190 Bridge would receive measures to protect the lower structure and foundation from potential periodic inundation. Project impacts to existing recreation facilities would be offset through floodproofing of facilities, providing replacement parking, and extending and widening one of the three existing boat launching ramps.

A total of 71 acres of riparian forest, 10 oak trees, 167 acres of Atriplex scrub, 421 acres of annual grassland, and 867 average annual acres of seasonal open water habitat in the Tulare lakebed would be adversely affected by the plan. Mitigation includes acquisition and management of contiguous lands to the project including 425 acres of grassland, and planting 82 acres of riparian habitat, 100 oak trees, and 150 acres of *Atriplex*/scrub habitat. Mitigation for reduced floodflows into the Tulare Lakebed would require purchase of 247 acres at nearby Creighton Ranch to create seasonal open water habitat. Adverse effects to cultural resources are unavoidable and will be coordinated with the SHPO. The proposed project also would affect twelve elderberry shrubs, host plant for the Federally listed endangered Valley elderberry longhorn beetle and five Tulare Pseudobahia, listed as threatened. In addition, one State-listed species, the striped adobe lily, would also be affected by the project. Mitigation for the beetle includes transplanting the twelve live elderberries, planting 168 elderberry seedlings, and 12 riparian plants. Mitigation for the Tulare pseudobahia and striped adobe lily includes moving the project boundary fence upslope of the affected plants to protect them in perpetuity. Mitigation for bats includes building a small dike or berm around two of the mine adits found on the South Fork Tule River. Consistent with Section 101 of Public Law 106-53, the authorization of the plan is subject to the completion of a final report of the Chief of Engineers on or before December 31, 1999, and subject to the conditions recommended in that final report.

COORDINATION:

The selected plan is compatible with Success Dam and surrounding areas. The environmental impacts have been assessed and are included in the report which was coordinated in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Public Law 91-190, as amended. The formulation of plans to explore the flood damage reduction and water supply opportunities available at the Success Lake and Tule River Basin site involved extensive coordination with numerous agencies at Federal, State and local levels.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:

Public involvement was provided throughout the study by means of informal meetings and discussions, formal scoping meetings and public workshops, and submitting the April 1999 Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for public review to obtain the views of interested parties on the opportunities for flood damage reduction and water supply on the

Distribution of DE's Public Notice

- **Names on study mailing**
  - **General public**
  - **Interested local groups**
  - **Local and state agencies**
  - **etc.**
- **Governor(s)**
- **Interested Congressional officials**

11, 12, 13 & 14

Washington Level and Administration

Step 11

Washington Level Policy Review

Submittal Requirements

- **Division submits 15 copies of Final feasibility report to CECW-AR after Division Engineer's Notice is signed.**
  - **PGM Compliance Memorandum**
  - **Documentation and certification of independent technical and legal review**
  - **Division Engineer's Public Notice**
  - **Report mailing/distribution list**
  - **Proposed Draft Chief of Engineer's Report**
  - **M-CACES cost estimate**
  - **Authorization Fact Sheet, project maps, and slides**



HQ Policy Review:

Responsibility -

- **Policy Review Branch (CECW-AR)**
  - **MISSION - Consider whether proposed project conforms with laws & policies**

Policy Review:

> **Analysis of decision factors and assumptions used to determine the extent and nature of Federal interest, project cost sharing and cooperation, and related issues.**

> **Ensures uniform application of established policy and procedures nationwide.**

> **Ensures that proposed action is consistent with overall goals and objectives of the program.**

State and Agency Review/ Filing of the EIS

> **Quick review of report recommendation and contents.**

> **Approval and coordination package provided to district to initiate 30-day state and agency review.**

> **District mails reports; EIS filed with EPA**

Review Assessment:

- > Review concentrates on adequacy of the District's compliance with the PGM.
- > Review considers new information in the Final Report not previously available and impact on critical issues.
- > APPENDIX B - ER 1165-2-203 "Policy Compliance Review Considerations" , include:
  - economics (benefits & costs)
  - engineering
  - environmental
  - local cooperation
  - plan formulation & selection



Review Assessment: (Cont.'d)

> **"The review prospective"- Value added comments and significant concerns on decision making process.**

> **All review comments shall contain:**
  - > **A clear statement of the concern**
  - > **The basis of the concern**
  - > **The significance of the concern**
  - > **Specific actions to resolve the concern**



> **HQUSACE Policy Assessment prepared.**

Review Assessment: (Cont.'d)

- HQ- MSC review Conference (site or telephone).
- MSC responses to policy assessment.
  - Report addendum/revised pages may be required.
- Senior Representatives meeting?
- Final Policy Compliance Review Documentation.

Final Review Package:

- **CECW-AR completes final review and prepares recommendation package, i.e.,**
  - **Summary of Feasibility Report**
  - **Certification of Policy Compliance Review**
  - **Policy Compliance Review Documentation**
  - **Technical/legal review Certification & Findings**
  - **Summary of agency and public comments**
  - **Correspondence received from State & Agency Review**
  - **Letters of Commitment from project sponsor(s) and summary of financial analysis.**



HQ Policy Review Schedule:

Activity **Elapsed Time**

Report received ---------- ------- **0**

S&A letters signed and sent to District ---------- **7- Days**

District sends reports to States and Agencies & files EIS ---------- **14- Days**

Begin 30-day NEPA review (publication of EIS notice in Fed Register) ---------- **21-Days**

Review input from team members ---------- **3 Weeks**

Draft HQUSACE Policy Assessment ---------- **3.5 Weeks**

HQUSACE Policy Assessment ---------- **4.5 Weeks**

HQ-MSC Review Conference ---------- **6**



Purpose

The Chief of Engineer's Report provides the Secretary of the Army with the views, findings and recommendations on project authorization.

Processing the COE Report:

- **Recommendation package & Draft Chief's Report received from CECW-AR following completion of policy review.**

- **Assess whether response letters are required to letters received during State & Agency review (to be signed by the Chief)**

Processing the COE Report: (Cont.'d)

- **Final Chief's Report and transmittal letters to the Congress are prepared.**
- **Report signed by the Chief of Engineers.**

- **Transmittal letters signed by Chief of Staff (Col.)**

Chief of Engineers Report



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20314-1000

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:

CECW-PE (10-1-7a)

23 DEC 1999

SUBJECT: Tule River Basin Investigation, California

THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

1. I submit for transmission to Congress my report on the study of flood damage reduction and agricultural water supply storage improvements for the Tule River Basin, California. It is accompanied by the report of the district and division engineers. These reports are in partial response to a resolution passed by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on 8 May 1964. This resolution requested review of the previous report on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin Streams, California, with a view towards determining whether any modification of the recommendations would be advisable, with particular reference to further coordinated development of the water resources of the San Joaquin River Basin, California.

2. Section 101(b) (4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (WRDA 1999), Public Law 106-53, authorized construction of the Success Dam, Tule River, California, project for flood damage reduction and water supply storage subject to completion of a favorable report of the Chief of Engineers not later than 31 December 1999 and subject to the conditions recommended in that final report. The authorizing language for this Success Dam/Tule River project reflects an earlier project cost estimate of $17,900,000. The cost estimate for the project has been refined to reflect current information on the project conditionally authorized by section 101(b)(4) of WRDA 1999. This report constitutes the final report of the Chief of Engineers required by WRDA 1999.

3. The plan developed by the district engineer consists of raising the existing Success Dam spillway by 10 feet. Spillway modifications include the placing of an ungated 10-foot-high concrete ogee weir over the entire existing spillway sill and widening the spillway from 200 to 365 feet. The State Highway 190 bridge would receive measures to protect the lower structure and foundation from potential periodic inundation. Project impacts to existing recreation facilities would be offset through floodproofing of facilities, providing replacement parking, and extending and widening one of the three existing boat launching ramps. The project would provide both flood damage reduction and agricultural water supply benefits and would resolve dam safety concerns with the existing project. The plan includes the

CECW-PE
SUBJECT: Tule River Basin Investigation, California

CECW-PE
SUBJECT: Tule River Basin Investigation, California

$13,970,000 and the non-Federal share of total project costs would be about $6,993,000. The non-Federal cash contribution is estimated at $1,443,000, with the balance consisting of $5,550,000, for the estimated creditable costs for lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and suitable borrow and dredged or excavated material disposal areas (LERRD). My recommendation is subject to the non-Federal sponsor agreeing to comply with applicable Federal laws and policies, including the following requirements:

CECW-PE
SUBJECT: Tule River Basin Investigation, California

d. Comply with Section 221 of Public Law 91-611, Flood Control Act of 1970, as amended, and Section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Public Law 99-662, as amended, which provides that the Secretary of the Army shall not commence the construction of any water resources project or separable element thereof, until the non-Federal sponsor has entered into a written agreement to furnish its required cooperation for the project or separable element

CECW-PE
SUBJECT: Tule River Basin Investigation, California

and the Uniform Regulations contained in 49 CFR part 24, in acquiring lands, easements, and rights-of-way, and performing relocations for construction, operation, and maintenance of the project, and inform all affected persons of applicable benefits, policies, and procedures in connection with said act.

l. Comply with all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations, including Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, and Department of Defense Directive 5500.11 issued pursuant thereto, as well as Army Regulation 600-7, entitled "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap in Programs and Activities Assisted or Conducted by the Department of the Army," and Section 402 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended (33 U.S.C. 701b-12), requiring non-Federal preparation and implementation of floodplain management plans.

m. Provide the non-Federal cost share of that portion of total cultural resource preservation mitigation and data recovery costs attributable to dam safety assurance, irrigation water supply and structural flood control that are in excess of 1 percent of the total amount authorized to be appropriated for dam safety assurance, irrigation water supply, and structural flood control.

n. Participate in and comply with applicable Federal floodplain management and flood insurance programs.

o. Do not use Federal funds to meet the non-Federal sponsor's share of total project costs unless the Federal granting agency verifies in writing that the expenditure of such funds is authorized.

p. Inform affected interests, at least annually, regarding the limitations of the protection afforded by the project.

q. Publicize floodplain information in the area concerned and provide this information to zoning and other regulatory agencies for their guidance and leadership in preventing unwise future development in the floodplain and in adopting such regulations as may be necessary to ensure compatibility between future development and protection levels provided by the project.

JOE N. BALLARD
Lieutenant General, U.S. Army
Chief of Engineers

5

Step 13
Administration Review

Administration - Who's Who?

OASA(CW) - Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works (OASA(CW))

ASA(CW) - Dr. Joseph W. Westphal

OMB - Office of Management and Budget

Executive Office of the President of the United States

ASA(CW) Report Processing:

- **Is the feasibility report complete?**

  - **If so, send the report to OMB.**
  - **Transmittal memorandum signed by ASA(CW).** **(see example)**
  - **Draft letters to Congress submittal of the Chief's Report pro (see example)**

Administration Review Process:



ASA(CW) Transmittal Letter to OMB - EXAMPLE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
CIVIL WORKS
108 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0108

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

30 OCT 1998

Honorable Jacob J. Lew
Director
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C. 20503

Dear Mr. Lew:

In accordance with Executive Order 12322, I am submitting for your review a draft letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The letter expresses the views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Army on whether to support authorization of an environmental restoration and recreation project along the Rio Salado (Salt River) and Indian Bend Wash in Phoenix and Tempe, Arizona.

The proposal is described in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 20, 1998. A copy of the report and other supporting documents are enclosed. The report was prepared in partial response to a resolution adopted by the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation on May 17, 1994.

Please advise this office whether the recommendations are consistent with Administration policy.

Sincerely,

Joseph W. Westphal
Assistant Secretary of the Army
(Civil Works)

9 Enclosures
(See page 2 for
list of encls)

Draft Transmittal Letter to Congress - EXAMPLE



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
CIVIL WORKS
108 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0108

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DRAFT

Honorable Newt Gingrich
Speaker of the House
of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In partial response to a resolution adopted by the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation on May 17, 1994, the Secretary of the Army recommends authorization of an environmental restoration and recreation project along the Rio Salado (Salt River) and Indian Bend Wash in Phoenix and Tempe, Arizona. The proposal is described in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 20, 1998, which includes other pertinent reports and documents. The views of the State of Arizona, the Departments of the Interior and Transportation, and the Environmental Protection Agency are set forth in the enclosed report.

The recommended plan provides for the restoration of ecosystem functions and fish and wildlife values to portions of the Indian Bend Wash (1.3 miles) and the Salt River (1 mile) in Tempe, and a 5-mile section of the Salt River in Phoenix. The recommended plan provides for water supply and infrastructure features consisting of extraction wells, pumps, and well-head treatment and distribution systems to reestablish and support native vegetation and wildlife habitats; drop structures and low flow channels with islands to contain moderate stream flow events; monitoring and adaptive management plans; and, a recreational plan consisting of trails, shelters, rest rooms, signage, parking, and associated features. A by-pass pump and pipeline are included as part of the Tempe reach to control water in the upstream habitat area.

The recommended plan would restore native plant communities and federally listed threatened and endangered species habitats, thereby returning the river to a more natural condition. The plan would also increase recreation and environmental education opportunities. The plan within the Phoenix reach would restore a total of about 525 acres consisting of approximately 130 acres of mesquite habitat, 99 acres of cottonwood/willow habitat, 58 acres of wetland marsh, 51 acres of aquatic strand/scrub habitat, and 187 acres of open edge habitat. The proposed

DRAFT

Encl 1



-2-

DRAFT

project would provide a total of about 440 acres of restored habitat along the Salt River channel and about 110 acres along the overflow banks of the channel. There would be an increase of approximately 282 annual habitat units in the Phoenix reach. The plan for the Tempe reach would provide for the environmental restoration of a total of about 150 acres consisting of approximately 30 acres of mesquite habitat, 20 acres of cottonwood/willow
strand/scrub habita
an increase of app
of the project.

Project outp
that are not amena
Therefore, to insu
effectiveness and
alternative restorat
justifies the cost of
habitat increases i
considered especi
certain species on
cost of the project.

Based on C
plan is estimated
5-year, $1,468,00
assess and establ
features is estimat
$80,200,000 is fo
recreation. Total F
non-Federal costs
ecosystem restora
Water Resources
sharing is in acco
non-Federal inter
repair, replaceme
cost currently esti

Each of the
constructing port
following authoriz



-3-

DRAFT

the authorized project, the sponsor will receive credit for such work. The amounts of the credit would be the lesser of actual work incurred by the sponsor, or the cost had the Federal Government constructed the same portion of the recommended plan at the time the work was done.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the report to the Congress. A copy of its letter is enclosed in the report.

Sincerely,

DRAFT

Joseph W. Westphal
Assistant Secretary of the Army
(Civil Works)

Enclosure

DRAFT

OMB - Introduction

"... before any agency submits to Congress for approval, appropriation, or legislation action any report, proposal or plan relating to a Federal or Federally assisted water or related land resources project or program, such report, proposal or plan sh be submitted to the OMB."

(Executive Order 12322, 17 Septer

OMB - What they do?

- **Coordinates reports within the executive branch.**
- **Review proposed projects to determine their relationship to the program of the President.**
- **Review Executive Orders.**

OMB - Report Review :

- Who gets the reports?

  Answer: Associate Director of Natural Resources, Energy and Science … Mr. Elgie Holstein
- Water and Energy Branch - Mr. Rick Murtens
- Very small staff - “Budget Examiners”
- ASA(CW) transmittal letter
- Draft letters to Congress
- Copies of Final Feasibility Report & Appendices
- PGM, Policy Review Assessment, other doc.

OMB - Report Review :

- Who goes?
- Kinds of things they ask or want to kr
- OMB Clearance Letter signed by Associate Director (see example)

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

APR 16 1996

The Honorable H. Martin Lancaster
Assistant Secretary of the
Army for Civil Works
Pentagon - Room 2E570
Washington, D.C. 20310-0108

Dear Mr. Lancaster:

As required by Executive Order 12322, the Office of Management and Budget has completed its review of your recommendation for the General Reevaluation Report and Environmental Assessment for San Juan Harbor, Puerto Rico.

The Administration supports authorization of this project for construction in accordance with your recommendation. The Office of Management and Budget does not object to your submitting this report to Congress.

Sincerely,

T.J. Glauthier
Associate Director
Natural Resources,
Energy, and Science

OMB Clearance Letter - EXAMPLE

AFTER OMB Clearance:

ASA(CW) sends Chief of Engineers Report to Congress for project authorization. (see example)

Congressional action ??

Transmittal Letter to Congress - EXAMPLE



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
CIVIL WORKS
108 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0108

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

6 OCT 1997

Honorable Newt Gingrich
Speaker of the House
of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Section 101(b)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1996 authorized a flood damage reduction and agricultural water supply project at the Terminus Dam, Kaweah River Basin, California. The Secretary of the Army supports the authorization and plans to implement the project through the normal budgetary process.

The authorized project is described in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 23, 1996, which includes other pertinent reports and comments. The report is in partial response to a resolution adopted by the House Committee on Public Works on May 8, 1964.

The views of the State of California; the Departments of the Interior, Transportation, and Energy; the Federal Emergency Management Agency; and the Environmental Protection Agency are set forth in the enclosed report.

The authorized project consists of modifying the Terminus Dam by constructing a 21-foot-high concrete ogee weir across the spillway sill and widening the spillway from 307 feet to 455 feet. This would raise the gross pool by about 21 feet, adding about 42,600 acre-feet of storage to Lake Kaweah. The gross pool would be operated jointly for flood control and agricultural water supply purposes. Over the project life, flood control storage space is expected to diminish as sediment accumulates in the reservoir. The project includes the relocation of the State Highway 198 bridge and its approaches. In addition, the project includes the purchase of about 827 acres of mitigation lands (about 461 acres for the loss or terrestrial habitats and about 366 acres for the loss of wetland habitats). The authorized project is the national economic development plan.



Based on October 1995 price levels, the total first cost of the authorized project is about $35,645,000, with a Federal cost of about $21,465,000, and a non-Federal cost of about $14,180,000. The cost sharing for the project is in accordance with the flood damage reduction and agricultural water supply cost sharing specified in WRDA 1986. In addition, in accordance with WRDA 1996 non-Federal interest would be required to implement a flood plain management plan for the project area.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress. A copy of its letter is enclosed in the report.

Sincerely,

John H. Zirschky
Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army
(Civil Works)

Enclosure

Authorization Process:

- **ASA(CW) submits Chief of Engineers' Report to Congress.**
- **Congress refers report to House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works for consideration.**
- **WRDA Fact Sheets are important sources**

  (see example)

Authorization Fact Sheet - EXAMPLE

29 February 2000

SUMMARY OF CORPS FEASIBILITY REPORT

1. Name of Report: Tres Rios, Arizona

   State: Arizona

   Congressional District(s): AZ-2, AZ-3

2. Type of Report: Ecosystem Restoration/Flood Control (Interim)

3. Location of Study Area: The study area consists of 7-miles of the Salt and Gila Rivers, southwest of the city of Phoenix in Maricopa County, Arizona.

4. Authority for Report: House Resolution 2425, dated 17 May 1994 and Public Law 761, Seventy-fifth Congress, Section 6 of the Flood Control Act of 1938.

5. Dates of Corps Reports:

   a. Division Engineer's Report/Public Notice. Estimated March 2000

   b. Chief of Engineers' Report: Estimated June 2000

6. Problems and Opportunities Identified in Study: The natural riparian ecosystem has been degraded within the study area. The causes of this degradation include elimination of natural flow events due to upstream dams, minimization of base flows, variations in surface waters due to effluent, and exotic species. The opportunity exists for ecosystem restoration and to create natural riparian habitat.

Significant flooding problems exist which cause damages to residential, commercial and agricultural properties. There is an opportunity to improve flood conveyance and provide area flood protection.

Water quality problems from point and non-point sources contribute to public health concerns. The opportunity exists to further improve water quality through engineered wetlands and best management practices.

7. Alternative Plans Considered: The alternatives have considered variations in the mix of engineered wetlands, open water marsh and cottonwood-willow riparian corridors. These features have been determined to be effective at providing significant native plant habitat value and in eliminating undesirable exotic plants, such as salt cedar (tamarisk). The ecosystem restoration features also provide incidental flood control benefits because they are effective at improving flood conveyance. The alternatives evaluated single purpose flood control features to provide flood protection to area residents.

4

ncludes a levee system, which
00-year flood protection. The
tlands for regulating the
ses, pipelines to distribute
ater/marsh areas.

store native plant communities,
, will return the river to a more
cation opportunities. The
value units. These habitat
country due to the scarcity and
of species on this unique and

The city of Phoenix (non-
he recommendations in the
project and interest to assume
t. Within the community, there
s historical significance in the

ect is heavily supported by
ish Department. In their letter
Corps for putting forward such

cember 20, 1999. The closing
comments received are being

ne estimated value of the LERRDs is

e levels):

eral O&M costs consist primarily of
ry to support the restoration features
emoval. The second is associated
associated with maintenance of the

Average Annual Adverse Effects ($1000)
280
8,310
8,590

unt Rate: 6.875%)

od protection. In
t a high priority status in
enix metropolitan area.
project, will help reverse
Nationwide, riparian and
tions they provide are
f their scarcity. These
d aquatic species including
nd egrets, and waterfowl.
al of nutrients or toxins,
and sediment and
d also benefit from the
ature photography,
related recreational

l(s): N/A

Committee Hearings:

- **Report recommendation presented by Director of Civil Works and/or ASA(CW).**

- **Testimony by:**
  - **Members of Congre**
  - **Other Federal Agen**
  - **States/Local Agencies**
  - **Public Interests**

Committee Hearings: (cont.'d)

Usually passed every two

(see example)

Water Resources Development Act - EXAMPLE

106TH CONGRESS, 1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT 106–298

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999

AUGUST 5, 1999.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. SHUSTER, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany S. 507]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 507), to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Development Act of 1999".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Sec. 101. Project authorizations.
Sec. 102. Small flood control projects.
Sec. 103. Small bank stabilization projects.
Sec. 104. Small navigation projects.
Sec. 105. Small projects for improvement of the quality of the environment.
Sec. 106. Small aquatic ecosystem restoration projects.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Small flood control authority.

Sec. 596. Phoenix, Arizona.
Sec. 597. National Harbor, Maryland.

TITLE VI—CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX TRIBE, AND STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION

Sec. 601. Definitions.
Sec. 602. Terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration.
Sec. 603. South Dakota Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Fund.
Sec. 604. Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and Lower Brule Sioux Tribe Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Funds.
Sec. 605. Transfer of Federal land to State of South Dakota.
Sec. 606. Transfer of Corps of Engineers land for Indian tribes.
Sec. 607. Administration.
Sec. 608. Study.
Sec. 609. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

SEC. 101. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) PROJECTS WITH CHIEF'S REPORTS.—The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports designated in this subsection:

(1) NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Nome Harbor improvements, Alaska: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 8, 1999, as amended by the Chief of Engineers on August 2, 1999, at a total cost of $25,651,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $20,192,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $5,459,000.

(2) SAND POINT HARBOR, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Sand Point Harbor, Alaska: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 13, 1998, at a total cost of $11,760,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $6,964,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $4,796,000.

(3) SEWARD HARBOR, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Seward Harbor, Alaska: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 8, 1999, at a total cost of $12,240,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $4,089,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $8,151,000.

(4) RIO SALADO (SALT RIVER), PHOENIX AND TEMPE, ARIZONA.—The project for flood control and environmental restoration, Rio Salado (Salt River), Phoenix and Tempe, Arizona: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 20, 1998, at a total cost of $88,048,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $56,355,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $31,693,000.

(5) TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, ARIZONA.—The project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and recreation, Tucson drainage area, Arizona: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 20, 1998, at a total cost of $29,900,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $16,768,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $13,132,000.

(6) AMERICAN AND SACRAMENTO RIVERS, CALIFORNIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Folsom Dam Modification portion of the Folsom Modification Plan described in the

United States Army Corps of Engineers Supplemental Information Report for the American River Watershed Project, California, dated March 1996, as modified by the report entitled "Folsom Dam Modification Report, New Outlets Plan," dated March 1998, prepared by the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency, at an estimated cost of $150,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $97,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $52,500,000. The Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the design and construction of modifications at Folsom Dam authorized by this paragraph.

(B) REOPERATION MEASURES.—Upon completion of the improvements to Folsom Dam authorized by subparagraph (A), the variable space allocated to flood control within the Reservoir shall be reduced from the current operating range of 400,000-670,000 acre-feet to 400,000-600,000 acre-feet.

(C) MAKEUP OF WATER SHORTAGES CAUSED BY FLOOD CONTROL OPERATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall enter into, or modify, such agreements with the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency regarding the operation of Folsom Dam and reservoir as may be necessary in order that, notwithstanding any prior agreement or provision of law, 100 percent of the water needed to make up for any water shortage caused by variable flood control operation during any year at Folsom Dam and resulting in a significant impact on recreation at Folsom Reservoir shall be replaced, to the extent the water is available for purchase, by the Secretary of the Interior.

(D) SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON RECREATION.—For the purposes of this paragraph, a significant impact on recreation is defined as any impact that results in a lake elevation at Folsom Reservoir below 435 feet above sea level starting on May 15 and ending on September 15 of any given year.

(E) UPDATED FLOOD MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall update the flood management plan for Folsom Dam authorized by section 9159(f)(2) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1993 (106 Stat. 1946), to reflect the operational capabilities created by the modification authorized by subparagraph (A) and improved weather forecasts based on the Advanced Hydrologic Prediction System of the National Weather Service.

(7) OAKLAND HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.—The project for navigation, Oakland Harbor, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 21, 1999, at a total cost of $252,290,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $128,081,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $124,209,000.

(8) SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood control, environmental restoration and recreation, South Sacramento County streams, California: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 6, 1998, at a total cost of $65,500,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $41,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $24,300,000.